



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

those who pass them along. A good story should never be spoiled by that.

JONATHAN WRIGHT

PLEASANTVILLE, NEW YORK,

January 18, 1921

REPLY TO PROFESSOR HORN

MANY times has the undersigned been found to be in error on historical questions. It is not easy to write during a period of over thirty years without occasionally committing mistakes. Even Newton once said, "It's impossible to print the book without faults." However, it is due to myself to state that not all the errors attributed to me are errors in reality. In not a few cases the critics themselves are in error. But never, before the appearance of Professor D. W. Horn's letter (SCIENCE, January 14, 1921), have I been accused of "Romancing in Science." Had Professor Horn been less excited and more contemplative, he would have written differently. My account of Galileo was prepared a quarter of a century ago. Were I to re-write it, I would make some slight changes. "Prior to Galileo it did not occur to any one actually to try the experiment" relating to acceleration. More recent research reveals that Galileo, like most great scientific men, had his forerunners. I say that Galileo publicly experimented "one morning." This may have been the correct time of day, but I am not now able to verify the statement. Galileo "allowed a one pound shot and a one hundred pound shot to fall together." From Galileo's "Dialogues Concerning two New Sciences" it appears that he did perform this experiment, but I am not sure that these were the particular weights used when experimenting before the university assembly. I have gone over sentence by sentence the passage quoted by Professor Horn and the above are the only changes which seem to me perhaps necessary. I repel as unjust the charge that I am "romancing in science."

Dr. Partridge rendered a service in calling attention to Galileo's experiments at the Tower of Pisa. However, I still think that the Doctor overstated his case, was wrong in

implying that Galileo made only one experiment, and without sufficient reason called in question the accuracy of Viviani's "Life of Galileo"—a life which Favaro, after very many years devoted to the study of Galileo, has found to be remarkably reliable. Of course, part of the discussion hinges on the word "exactly." No description of an experiment can be exact in every detail. However, if essentials suffice, then our knowledge of Galileo's experiments on falling bodies is exact, for we know exactly the purpose of the experiments, as well as the mode of experimentation, namely, the dropping of different weights of a variety of materials—mention being made of some of the materials dropped.

Professor Horn quotes: *Fortis imaginatio generat causum.* I agree, but whose *casus* is it really?

FLORIAN CAJORI

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A CORRECTION

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The times are actually worse than I realized when writing recently about "Romancing in Science." The opening quotation should have read "O tempora," instead of "O tempus." The peculiar appropriateness of this quotation is apparent, for the correction came to me (from New York) as part of an *anonymous* letter!

DAVID WILBUR HORN

BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA

MEMOIR OF G. K. GILBERT

THE undersigned is engaged in the preparation of a memoir of the late G. K. Gilbert, to be published by the National Academy of Sciences, and would be obliged if geologists and others who possess letters from him or who recall incidents that throw light upon his character would submit them for incorporation in the story of his life. His great contributions to geological science are published and fully accessible; but the smaller non-scientific matters which give the life of a man its finer savor can be learned only by personal communication from his friends. A good number of such communications have been already received; they are of so great